# JUDICIAL SALARIES

# REPORT

OF THE

# SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INCREASE OF JUDICIAL SALARIES

SUBMITTED

AT THE MEETING OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AT PHILADELPHIA, PA., JULY 8-10, 1924



## PRESENTED BY MR. OVERMAN

FEBRUARY 3 (calendar day, FEBRUARY 14), 1925.—Ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

# JUDICIAL SALARIES

THOTER

# SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INCREASE OF JUDICIAL SALARIES

AN THE METTING OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AT PHILAPPLA PALA HUEY S-10, 1924 (



PRESENTED BY MR. OVERMAN

Remarks a reason des day, Persanary 14s 1025 - Ordered to be printed

WASHING OFFICE

# REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON INCREASE OF JUDICIAL SALARIES TO THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIA-TION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That a special committee of seven members, appointed by the president, be created, to be known as the "Committee on salaries

of Federal judges."

2. That the association indorse the principles and subject matter (adequate compensation to the Federal judiciary) as set forth in House bills 7785, 7786, and 9921, and direct the executive committee, or such other committee of the association to which it may delegate the matter, or both, to speak authoritatively for the association before the Congress of the United States upon this important matter.

3. That the association direct the incoming president to lay before the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, also before the State bar associations of the several States and before the larger local bar associations, the facts as to the inadequacy of the salaries paid to the United States judiciary, especially to the United States Supreme Court Justices, and call attention to the great disproportion of compensation in the larger cities paid to the United States district judges, when contrasted with the salaries paid State judges of general jurisdictions; and also ask

for legislation to make the salary compensation adequate.
4. That the association direct its incoming president to lay before the State bar associations of the several States, and also before the larger local bar associations, such information as this association may have on the question of salaries of State judges, and request such associations investigate this matter, and ascertain whether or not the judicial salaries in their respective States are adequate and commensurate with the present-day cost of living, and such as the respective judicial offices should command, and that the said associations communicate their findings to their members and to other members of the profession and to the legislatures of the respective States.

### REPORT

Your committee appointed to consider the increase of judicial salaries beg to report that owing to the widely scattered residences of the committee that there has been no opportunity for personal meeting, and the greater exchange of ideas has been handled by letter.

In February, 1924, at the time of the meeting of the American Institute of Law, the chairman and Mr. Beverly L. Hodghead met in Washington and personally went over the work of the committee. During the past year your committee has largely confined its efforts to disseminating the information about judicial salaries, concerning which there is quite a lot of misinformation. Believing that sentiment in Congress was not ripe for the introduction of a bill regarding the salaries of the Federal judges, the introduction of such a bill was held off for the present, and the committee endeavored to give as much publicity to matters as was practicable, in view of the limited appropriation to the committee of \$250.

In February, the 1923 committee report was printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. No. 53, 68th Cong., 1st sess.) through the kindness of Senator Lee S. Overman, the ranking Democrat (and former

chairman) of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Through the assistance of Mr. Frederick E. Wadhams, our efficient treasurer, franked envelopes to the 20,000 members were addressed, and this Senate document, containing the 1923 report, was placed

in the hands of each member of the association.

In addition, about 500 other copies, together with information as to the cost at which reprints of this Senate document could be secured, was sent out to the secretaries of the State bar associations, and the secretaries of the larger local bar associations (1923 report, pp. 482 to 485), and a number of other members of the profession who we thought would be interested in this question. Owing to this report being prepared so soon after the sending out of this information, it is not possible to state how many secretaries of State bar associations or of the larger local bar associations have availed themselves of this opportunity of placing this information in the hands of their membership, but it is hoped to make that report verbally at the annual meeting at Philadelphia in July.

Since the last report was compiled, it is a pleasure to our committee to chronicle the advance in salaries in supreme courts (courts of last

resort) in three States.

The State of Illinois has increased their supreme court salaries from \$10,000-to \$15,000, and likewise has increased the salaries of the judges of the superior and circuit court of Cook County (Chicago) also to \$15,000. Illinois has also passed an act allowing each judge of the supreme court a private secretary at the salary of \$5,000, which is the salary paid supreme court judges by five States, and is larger than the salaries paid in three other States.

The State of New Jersey by act of March 4, 1924, increased the salaries of their supreme court judges and of the vice chancellors to \$18,000. They also increased the compensation of the lay judges to \$40 per day for each day they shall attend the court or while engaged in the examination of cases or the writing of opinions. Also the salaries of the 10 circuit judges were increased to \$16,000.

The State of Virginia, in April, 1924, increased the salaries of the judges of their supreme court of appeals from \$5,000 to \$6,000 and their circuit judges from \$3,000 to \$3,600, and their statute provides that the board of supervisors of the various counties may augment such salaries.

A résumé of the salary increase of supreme court judges during the past six years is as follows:

Table I.—Supreme court salary increases, 1919-1924

State	Former salary	Increased to—	State	Former salary	Increased to—
1919	salery	varon sams	1921		
Pennsylvania	\$13,000	\$14,000	Pennsylvania	\$14,000	\$17,500
New Jersey	12,000	14,000	Michigan	7,000	10,000
Connecticut	7, 500	9,000	Wyoming	5,000	7,000
Wisconsin	7, 500	8, 500	North Carolina	5, 350	6, 350
West Virginia	5, 500	8,000	Maine	5,000	6,000
Delaware	6,000	7, 250	New Hampshire	5,000	6,000
Washington	6,000	7,000	Florida	4,500	5, 500
Alabama	5,000	6, 500	Vermont	4,000	5,000
rexas		6, 500	A DUST AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF		Stanish in
Oklahoma	4,000	6,000	1922		William G
North Carolina	4,000	5, 350	Mountand	6, 800	8, 500
Oregon	4, 500	5, 250	Maryland	0,000	0,000
		and the state of t	1923		
1920	BE COUNTY		Illinois	10,000	15,000
Massachusetts	10,000	12,000	Indiana	6,000	7, 500
Ohio	6, 500	8, 500	Indiana	0,000	1,000
Rhode Island	7,000	8,000	1924		1
Louisiana		8,000	1924	1	1 1 1 1 1 1
	4, 500	7, 500	New Jersey	14,000	18,000
NebraskaGeorgia	5,000	7,000	Virginia	5,000	6,000
		6, 500		0,000	0,000
Mississippi Kansas	5,000	6,000		THURSDAY T	A STATE OF THE STA

Of the 33 increases listed above it will be noted that three States are duplicated, New Jersey (1919 and 1924), Pennsylvania (1919 and and 1921), and North Carolina (1919 and 1921), which makes the actual number of States 30, leaving 18 States who have not increased

supreme court salaries for several years.

Of these 30 States legislating on this matter during the past decade, it is noticeable that 12 States pay above the average of \$7,701.02, while 18 States (Indiana and Nebraska \$7,500 each, Delaware \$7,250, Georgia, Washington, and Wyoming \$7,000 each, Alabama, Mississippi, and Texas \$6,500 each, North Carolina \$6,350, Kansas, Maine, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, and Virginia \$6,000, Florida \$5,500, Oregon \$5,250, and Vermont \$5,000) pay less than that average.

The other two States paying above the average (New York \$13,700, fixed in 1895, and California \$8,000, fixed in 1906) set their salaries

many years ago.
Of the 21 States paying \$6,000 or less, their salaries were fixed as follows: Six thousand dollars, Iowa (1902), Kansas (1920), Maine (1920), Nevada (1907), New Hampshire (1921), New Mexico (1919), Oklahoma (1919), and Virginia (1924); \$5,500, Florida (1921), North Dakota (1917), and Tennessee (1917); \$5,250, Oregon (1919); \$5,000, Arizona (1911), Colorado (1883), Idaho (1907), Kentucky (1891), Uko (1907), Virginia (1911), Sept. (1911), Sept. (1912), Sep Utah (1905), Vermont (1921); \$4,500, South Carolina (1917); \$4,000, Arkansas (1902); \$3,000, South Dakota (1899).

Ten (out of 21) of these States have not increased supreme court

salaries within the past 13 years, while one has been unchanged for

41 years and another for 25 years.

We recognize that salaries of State judges (both appellate and trial) are properly subjects for consideration by the several State bar associations and the local bar associations in the respective judicial districts or divisions, yet we feel sure all lawyers and law makers welcome the assembling of facts that bear on any matter that comes before them for decision. We commend to each member of the profession a study of the conditions existing in his own State.

The salaries now paid supreme court judges for the 283 State courts of last resort average \$7,701.06. These salaries set out by the various States are in detail as follows:

Table II.—Supreme court salary

State	Rank	Salary	State	Rank	Salary
New Jersey	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8-10 11-14 15-19 20-23	\$18, 000 17, 500 15, 000 13, 700 12, 000 10, 000 9, 000 8, 500 8, 000 7, 500	Alabama, Mississippi and Texas North Carolina. Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mex- ico, Oklahoma and Virginia. Florida, North Dakota and Tennessee Oregon Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Ken- tucky, Utah and Vermont South Carolina Arkansas South Dakota	24-26 27 28-35 36-38 39 40-45 46 47 48	\$6, 500 6, 350 5, 500 5, 250 5, 000 4, 500 4, 000 3, 000

Average for 48 States is \$7,701.06.

#### COST OF STATE COURTS

The last United States publication giving the costs of courts in the several States was "Financial statistics of States, 1919," which appeared in September, 1920, and as the 1920 census was announced in December of that year, it is practicable to make a showing as to the cost of courts (supreme and trial courts) in the several States on a per capita basis.

In 1919 the aggregate salary of all of the judges of the supreme courts of each of the 48 States was \$2,040,650, which on the then estimated 284 judges of these 48 courts was an annual average salary of \$7,185. As the average salary in 1924 is \$7,701.06, only \$516 greater than at that time, it will be seen that the statistics of 1919 will vary less than 10 per cent for the year 1924.

These figures show that taking the population of the United States of 105,271,535, that the 48 States expended on supreme courts (their court of last resort) an aggregate sum of \$3,527,729, and that they expended on other courts \$15,237,026, which works out a per capita expenditure of 3.351 cents for their supreme courts and of 14.474 cents for other courts. This information was compiled and given out by the chairman in 1922, and is here given again as the information only reached a limited number of the association. These figures in detail are as follows:

Table III.—State expenditures for courts, 1919; also population and per capita

and in our bugs shows horse		Expenditures		Per capita	
State	Population	Supreme	Other	Supreme	Other
United States	105, 271, 535	\$3, 527, 729	\$15, 237, 026	Cents 3, 351	Cents 14, 47
New England	7, 400, 909	359, 543	1, 930, 337	4. 858	26, 085
Maine	768, 014 443, 083 352, 428 3, 852, 356 604, 397 1, 380, 631	76, 160 30, 852 39, 688 96, 120 65, 565 54, 158	16, 400 50, 630 252, 131 603, 624 324, 158 683, 394	9, 907 6, 963 11, 261 2, 494 10, 351 3, 922	2. 138 11. 426 71. 54 15. 668 53. 633 49. 498
Middle Atlantic	22, 260, 746	662, 403	3, 486, 853	2. 975	15. 662
New York New Jersey Pennsylvania	10, 384, 829 3, 155, 900 8, 720, 017	274, 987 236, 892 150, 524	1, 996, 906 229, 567 1, 260, 380	2. 647 7. 506 1. 726	19. 132 7. 274 14. 459
East North Central	21, 475, 543	467, 902	2, 170, 880	2. 178	10. 108
Ohio_ Indiana Illinois_ Michigan_ Wisconsin	5, 759, 394 2, 930, 390 6, 485, 280 3, 668, 412 2, 632, 067	88, 543 64, 840 137, 502 91, 623 85, 394	694, 835 372, 286 612, 095 265, 283 226, 381	1. 537 2. 212 2. 120 2. 497 3. 244	12. 064 12. 704 9. 438 7. 231 8. 600
West North Central	12, 543, 107	490, 047	1, 321, 292	3. 906	10. 541
Minnesota Iowa Missouri North Dakota South Dakota Nebraska Kansas	2, 387, 175 2, 404, 021 3, 404, 055 645, 680 636, 547 1, 296, 372 1, 769, 257	86, 935 70, 865 129, 624 38, 190 30, 857 73, 686 59, 890	199, 998 250, 364 444, 572 43, 310 37, 301 166, 120 174, 627	3. 641 2. 947 3. 807 5. 945 4. 847 5. 684 3. 385	8. 378 10. 414 13. 060 6. 707 5. 869 12. 814 9. 870
South Atlantic	13, 552, 691	420, 706	1, 718, 325	3. 104	12. 678
Delaware Maryland Virginia West Virginia. North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida	223, 003 1, 449, 651 2, 309, 187 1, 463, 701 2, 559, 123 1, 683, 724 2, 895, 832 968, 470	26, 787 85, 465 56, 617 60, 201 40, 833 25, 960 89, 266 35, 577	11, 147 725, 179 315, 662 123, 381 86, 710 98, 851 111, 580 245, 815	12. 011 5. 898 2. 451 4. 112 1. 595 1. 541 3. 082 3. 673	4, 998 50, 024 13, 669 8, 423 3, 389 5, 870 3, 853 25, 381
East South Central	8, 892, 877	275, 397	1, 638, 834	3.096	18. 439
Kentucky Tennessee Alabama Mississippi	2, 416, 230 2, 337, 855 2, 348, 174 1, 790, 618	83, 037 97, 240 56, 503 38, 617	1, 013, 940 298, 605 198, 517 127, 772	3. 436 4. 155 2. 406 2. 156	41. 963 12. 772 8. 454 7. 135
West South Central	10, 242, 940	276, 884	1, 646, 949	2. 703	16.078
Arkansas Louisiana Oklahoma Texas	1, 752, 204 1, 798, 509 2, 028, 680 4, 663, 547	94, 478 33, 571 118, 295 30, 540	107, 111 228, 702 134, 039 1, 177, 097	5. 392 1. 866 5. 831 654	6. 112 12. 716 6. 607 25. 240
Mountain	3, 335, 851	303, 372	648, 651	9. 094	19, 474
Montana	548, 889 431, 866 194, 402 939, 629 360, 359 333, 903 449, 396 77, 407	41, 480 47, 888 21, 729 62, 298 30, 900 25, 695 35, 695 38, 314	157, 357 105, 389 59, 732 97, 894 74, 603 27, 820 119, 592 6, 264	7. 577 11. 088 11. 178 6. 630 8. 574 7. 358 7. 942 49. 496	28. 668 24. 403 30. 726 10. 419 20. 702 8. 331 26. 611 8. 092
Pacifie	5, 566, 871	271, 475	674, 905	4. 876	12, 123
Washington Oregon California	1, 356, 621 783, 389 3, 426, 861	90, 233 51, 796 129, 446	78, 539 167, 777 428, 589	6. 651 6. 611 3. 777	5. 788 21. 415 12. 506

If from that table we arrange the States by rank according to their per capita expenditures, we have the following tables, the first one showing the per capita expenditure for supreme courts and the other showing the per capita expenditure for other courts.

## TABLE IV .- Supreme courts

		Per capita			Per capita
1	Nevada	40 406	25	Connecticut	(cents) 3, 922
2.	Delaware	19 011	26.	Missouri	3 807
2	Vermont	11 261	27	California	3 777
0.	Wroming	11 179	20	Florida	3. 673
4.	WyomingIdaho	11 000		Minnesota	
5.	Di di Ti-di	10 251			
0.	Rhode Island	10. 551	50.	Kentucky	0. 400
	Maine		31.	Kansas	3. 385
	New Mexico			Wisconsin	
9.	Utah	7. 942		Georgia	
	Montana			Iowa	
11.	New Jersey	7. 506		New York	
12.	Arizona	7. 358	36.	Michigan Massachusetts	2. 497
13.	New Hampshire	6. 963	37.	Massachusetts	2. 494
14.	Washington	6. 651	38.	Virginia	2. 451
15.	Colorado	- 6. 630		Alabama	
16.	Oregon	6. 611	40.	Indiana	2. 212
17.	North Dakota	5. 945	41.	Indiana Mississippi	2. 156
18	Maryland	5 898	42.	Illinois	2. 120
19.	Oklahoma	5. 831	43.	IllinoisLouisiana	1. 866
	Nebraska		44.	Pennsylvania	1. 726
	Arkansas		45	North Carolina	1 595
	South Dakota		46	South Carolina	1 541
	Tennessee			Ohio	
	West Virginia			Texas	
24.	West Virginia	4. 114	10.	1 CAAS	004

### TABLE V .- Other courts

2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13.	Utah Florida Texas Idaho Oregon New Mexico	53. 633 50. 024 49. 498 41. 963 30. 726 28. 668 26. 611 25. 381 25. 240 24. 403 21. 415 20. 702	26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36.	New Hampshire	- 10. 419 - 10. 414 - 9. 870 - 9. 438 - 8. 600 - 8. 454 - 8. 423 - 8. 331 - 8. 092 - 7. 274 - 7. 231
7.		28. 668	31.	Alabama	_ 8. 454
8.	Utah	26, 611	32.	West Virginia	_ 8, 423
9.	Florida	25. 381	33.	Minnesota	_ 8. 378
10.	Texas	25. 240	34.	Arizona	_ 8. 331
11.	Idaho	24. 403	35.	Nevada	_ 8. 092
12.	Oregon	21. 415		New Jersey	_ 7. 274
13.	New Mexico	20. 702		Michigan	_ 7. 231
14.	New York	19. 132		Mississippi	
15.	Massachusetts	15. 668	39.	North Dakota	_ 6. 707
	Pennsylvania			Oklahoma	
17.	Virginia	13. 669	41.	Arkansas	6. 112
	Missouri		42.	South Carolina	
	Nebraska		43.	South Dakota	
	Tennessee		44.	Washington	
	Louisiana		45.	Delaware	4. 998
22.	Indiana	12. 704	46.	Georgia	_ 3. 853
23.	California		47.	North Carolina	_ 3. 389
24.	Ohio	12. 064	48.	Maine	2. 135

It is of interest to note that only two States had a per capita expenditure for their supreme courts exceeding 12 cents, and these are explained by the fact that Nevada only has 77,407 people and

Delaware 223,003 population. Again, 40 States spent less than 8 cents, and that 27 out of this 40 spent less than 5 cents per capita.

The figures for the per capita expenditure for other courts were equally surprising. Only three States spent exceeding 50 cents per capita. Including these three there were only 10 States that spent exceeding 25 cents per capita. Out of the 38 that spent less than 25 cents per capita there were 9 that spent between 10 cents and 13 cents per capita, while 21 others spent less than 10 cents per capita on their trial courts.

These per capita expenditures for supreme courts and for other courts should be considered in connection with the average cost of State government per capita of \$6.05 for the entire United States varying from \$19.25 in Arizona down to \$2.40 in South Carolina. (Pp. 32 and 62 of Financial Statistics of States, 1919.)

The per capita expenditure in the several States given above will

practically hold for the present time.

Your committee has revised the table of judicial salaries as set out in the report last year on pages 467 to 469, of the 1923 Proceedings, and here brings forward the same as follows:

# Table VI.—Salaries of judges in various States

Alabama: Supreme court, \$6,500; appellate court, \$6,500; circuit court, \$4,000; some few counties have authority to add to salaries, Mobile \$3,000, Montgomery \$2,000, Jefferson \$2,400, and Tuscaloosa \$1,200.

Arizona: Supreme court, \$5,000; superior court, \$3,500 to \$4,500. Arkansas: Supreme court, \$4,000; circuit court, \$3,000; chancery court, \$3,000. California: Supreme court, \$8,000; court of appeals, \$7,000; superior court,

Colorado: Supreme court, \$5,000; district court, \$4,000.

Connecticut: Supreme court of errors, \$9,000; superior court, \$9,000; court of common pleas, \$7,000.

Delaware: Supreme court, \$7,500; chancellor, \$7,500. Florida: Supreme court, \$5,500; circuit court, \$5,000.

Georgia: Supreme court, \$7,000; court of appeals, \$7,000; superior court, \$5,000; certain counties may add additional \$3,000.

Idaho: Supreme court, \$5,000; district court, \$4,000.
Illinois: Supreme court, \$15,000; appellate court, \$12,000; circuit court, \$6,500. Cook County (Chicago) appellate court, \$15,000; circuit court, \$15,000; superior court, \$15,000; municipal court, \$9,000.

Indiana: Supreme court, \$7,500; appellate court, \$7,500; circuit court, \$5,000 to \$7,000.

Iowa: Supreme court, \$6,000; district court, \$4,000.

Kansas: Supreme court, \$6,000; district court, \$4,000. Kentucky: Court of appeals, \$5,000; circuit judges, \$4,200; in Jefferson, Fayette, Campbell, and Kenton Counties, circuit judges \$3,000 from State plus \$2,000 from county.

Louisiana: Supreme court, \$8,000; court of appeals, \$6,000; district court, \$4,000 to \$5,000.

Maine: Supreme judicial court, \$6,000; superior court, \$4,000.

Maryland: Court of appeals, \$8,500; circuit court, \$5,750; supreme bench of Baltimore City, \$7,375.

Massachusetts: Supreme judicial court, \$12,000; superior court, \$10,000. Michigan: Supreme court, \$10,000; circuit court, \$5,000 to \$11,250.

Minnesota: Supreme court, \$7,000; district court, \$4,800; counties having 75,000 population may add \$1,500. Counties with area over 15,000 square miles may add \$1,500.

Mississippi: Supreme court, \$6,500; circuit court, \$4,000; chancery court, \$4,000.

Missouri: Supreme court, \$7,500; court of appeals, \$6,000; circuit court, \$3,000

to \$5,000. St. Louis circuit court, \$8,000.

Montana: Supreme court, \$7,500; district court, \$4,800.

Nebraska: Supreme court, \$7,500; district court, \$5,000.

Nevada: Supreme court, \$6,000; district court, \$4,500 and \$5,000.

New Hampshire: Supreme court, \$6,000; superior court, \$6,000.

New Jersey: Supreme court, \$18,000; vice chancellors, \$18,000; circuit judges, \$16,000; lay judges, \$40 per day of court sitting or writing opinions.

New Mexico: Supreme court, \$6,000; district court, \$6,000.

New York: Court of Appeals, \$13,700; appellate division and supreme court, \$17,500 in departments 1 and 2; \$10,000 in departments 3 and 4.

North Carolina: Supreme court, \$6,000; superior court \$5,000 (plus \$1,250

traveling expenses).

North Dakota: Supreme court, \$5,500; district court, \$4,000.

Ohio: Supreme court, \$8,500; appellate court, \$8,000; court of common pleas, \$3,000 plus \$25 for each 1,000 of population up to 120,000, and \$5 for each 1,000 over 120,000, in no case exceeding \$5,000.

Oklahoma: Supreme court, \$6,000; criminal court of appeals, \$6,000; district

court, \$4,000.

Oregon: Supreme court, \$5,250; circuit court, \$4,000; counties having 100,000 population and over may pay \$1,500 additional.

Pennsylvania: Supreme court, \$17,500; superior court, \$16,000; common pleas

\$8,000 to \$12,000; orphans court, \$8,000 to \$12,000.
Rhode Island: Supreme court, \$8,000; superior court, \$7,500.

South Carolina: Supreme court, \$4,500; circuit court, \$4,000.
South Dakota: Supreme court, \$3,000; circuit court, \$2,500.
Tennessee: Supreme court, \$5,500; court of civil appeals, \$5,500; chancery court, \$4,000; circuit court, \$4,000.

Texas: Supreme court, \$6,500; court of civil appeals, \$5,000; court of criminal appeals, \$6,500; district court, \$4,000.

Utah: Supreme court, \$5,000; district court, \$4,000.

Vermont: Supreme court, \$5,000; superior court, \$5,000.

Virginia: Supreme court of appeals, \$6,000; circuit court, \$3,600; city court,

\$3,000 to \$3,500; counties and cities may supplement salaries.

Washington: Supreme court, \$7,000; superior court, \$6,000 in counties over 210,000 population, \$5,000 in counties over 125,000, and \$4,500 in remaining districts.

West Virginia: Supreme court of appeals, \$8,000; circuit court, \$3,300 to \$6,000. Wisconsin: Supreme court, \$8,500; circuit court, \$6,500. Wyoming: Supreme court, \$7,000; district court, \$6,500.

#### FEDERAL JUDGES

	014 500
United States Supreme Court	\$14, 500
Circuit Court of Appeals	8, 500
Court of Appeals of District of Columbia	8, 500
Court of Customs Appeals	8, 500
United States district judges	7, 500
Supreme Court of the District of Clumbia	7, 500
Court of Claims	7, 500
Territorial district judges-Alaska, Canal Zone, Hawaii, and Porto	
Rico	7, 500

(Note.—This table no doubt contains many inaccurate statements, assembled as it has been from many sources, but it is believed that no salary has been understated. Corrections of errors in the table will be welcomed.—American Bar Association chairman.)

A convenient grouping of the salaries of the State supreme court judges (283 in number) can be shown by taking the conventional, unofficial system, which works out as follows:

#### TABLE VII.—Reporter system

	Average salary
1. Northeastern	\$11, 572. 00
2. Atlantic	10, 140, 00
3. Northwestern	7, 079. 00
4. Southern	6, 608. 00
5. Southeastern	6, 393. 00
6. Pacific	6, 113. 00
7. Southwestern	5, 722. 00
Average for 283 justices	7, 701. 06

#### COST OF FEDERAL COURTS

When the average taxpayer is told that the total ordinary expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year of 1923 was \$3,294,-627,529, which was an annual per capita expenditure of \$29.77, he

holds up his hands and says taxes ought to be reduced.

If he is asked how much of this per capita expenditure is for the purpose of courts of justice of the United States Government, he will at once admit his ignorance, but assert that it is a considerable amount, certainly as much as several dollars.

What are the facts?

Have you looked into the facts?

Have you an opinion upon this matter based upon the exercise of

your judgment, after looking into the facts?

The 1923 annual report of the Attorney General of the United States, on page 109, shows that the total expenditures for the carrying on of the courts of the United States and the Department of Justice for its maintenance aggregated \$22,374,955.21, which is a per capita expenditure of 22.204 cents. Of this amount there was expended \$7,823,164.74 for carrying on the Department of Justice, which is a

per capita expenditure of 7.431 cents.

The total amount expended for United States courts for all purposes was \$14,551,790.47, which is a per capita expenditure of 13.823 cents for each of the slightly over 105,000,000 people of the United States. The total amount spent for judicial salaries, including the Supreme Court, the circuit courts of appeals, the district courts, the courts of the District of Columbia, the Court of Claims, et al. was \$1,535,991.91, or a per capita expenditure of 1.459 cents. Doesn't it shock the sensibility of the reader who thinks differently to realize that when he buys a penny picture post card and affixes a 1-cent stamp that he expends a larger amount than the average annual per capita cost of salaries of Federal judges of all kinds?

Again the average citizen thinks that the Supreme Court of the United States costs a great deal of money. The Attorney General's report shows that the total expenditures by the Government for that court was \$233,278.58, or a per capita expenditure of about one-fifth

of 1 cent.

These figures sound so startling to the average reader that your committee feels that it should state that they are taken from pages 109, 302, 303, and 304 of the Attorney General's report for 1923.

#### PENDING BILLS

There are now pending before the Judiciary Committee two bills relating to salaries introduced by Representative Daniel F. Minahan, No. 7786 being to increase the salaries of the United States Supreme Court judges to \$25,000, the Chief Justice to receive a salary of \$26,500, and House bill No. 7785 to increase the salaries of the district judges to a sum equal to the salaries paid the trial judges in the judicial districts for which they are appointed, the salary to be not less than \$12,000 nor more than \$18,000; further to increase the salaries of the circuit judges to a sum equal to the salaries paid to the State judges having appellate jurisdiction, with a minimum of \$13,000 and a maximum of \$19,000, also to increase the salary of the

judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia to \$13,000 and the justices of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia and judges of the Court of Claims and the judges of the United States

Court of Customs Appeals to \$12,000.

Since the preparation of this report we have been advised of the introduction of House bill No. 9221 by Representative George S. Graham, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, which provides for the raising of the salary of the associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States to \$20,000. and the Chief Justice to \$20,500, the circuit judges in the second circuit to \$15,000, the circuit judges in the third, seventh, eighth, and ninth circuits to \$14,000, and the circuit judges in the first, fourth, fifth, and sixth circuits to \$13,000; also, the United States district judges to \$10,000, with the provision that where the population exceeds 2,000,000 the salary may be increased \$500 for each 1,000 excess of population over that sum; also to increase the salaries of the judges of the Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia and the judges of the Court of Customs Appeals to \$15,000, and the judges of the Court of Claims and the judges of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia to \$13,000.

Respectfully submitted.

ALEXANDER B. ANDREWS,
Chairman, Raleigh, N. C.
BEVERLY L. HODGHEAD,
San Francisco, Calif.
ASHLEY COCKRILL,
Little Rock, Ark.
CHARLES R. BROCK,
Denver, Colo.
DONALD FRASER,
Fowler, Ind.